

they are being "high pressured," the schemes stir up resentment toward management. In the case here discussed, the advertising was certainly not "high pressure." It was simply ineffective. And no improvement of the wording would have rendered it more effective.

This does not mean that the written word should be eliminated from management-labor communication. Word of mouth communication is readily subject to distortion as it passes from supervisor to worker and worker to worker. A notice on the bulletin board has the advantage of telling the official story and of being available for ready reference, so that many misinterpretations may thus be avoided.

However, a notice which is not personally introduced to the workers by a supervisor, is likely to be ignored or read with only passing interest. Furthermore, notices, if they communicate at all, are only one-way communication. When the supervisor discusses a program with his men and answers their questions, we have two-way communication in operation. Our studies³ have shown that

this type of communication is essential for gaining cooperation of workers.

I suggest then that whenever management has a new program, a change in company policy, or a change in operations to introduce, the first announcement of it should be made in person by the supervisor. Only when the change has been explained and discussed should the notices be posted. In that way, they can serve to clarify the situation and to clear up misunderstandings, instead of building up confusion, resentment, and false rumors as they often do when they appear on bulletin boards without warning.

We must recognize that worker attitudes toward the company and its policies are formed primarily through contacts with supervisors and fellow workers. Changes in worker attitudes and behavior can only be achieved through these human relations channels. Notices, posters, and other literature may, when properly used, serve as a useful auxiliary to human relations. They can never be effective as a substitute for human relations.

SOME PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION PROBLEMS IN TECHNICAL COLLABORATION AMONG NATIONS¹

By

Paul L. Guest²

It is the purpose of this paper to explain briefly a technical program being carried out by the government of the United States in collaboration with the governments of a number of the other American republics, and to call attention to some of the problems pertaining to the administrative personnel for a program of this type.

It is generally recognized by students of government and business in the United States that until comparatively recent years the economic development of this country has followed largely a pattern envisaged by the term *laissez faire*. However, government has been assuming an ever-expanding

role in the lives of the individual citizen, especially during the past two decades, until today we find the Federal government carrying on multitudinous activities of considerably diverse nature, quite apart from the military. This expansion and diversification of government interest in the daily lives of the American people has brought with it the responsibility of administering government agencies in widely divergent fields of endeavor. Much of this responsibility is relatively new in the realm of American government and of a scope never before undertaken. Quite naturally, there have been clashes of opinion with regard to the administration of many agencies

3. See Gardner, B.B. and the author, "The Man in the Middle, Position and Problems of the Foreman," bulletin #1, Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago, 1945.

1. The views of public policy and administration expressed in this article are the private opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the agency for which he works.

2. Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

but these differences have been primarily of a domestic nature since the direct influence of the agencies involved has not extended beyond the borders of the United States.

During the past decade while the above change in government-business-individual relationship was taking place within the country, the United States also intensified its Good Neighbor policy with respect to the nations of Latin America. Participation of the Federal government in this movement has been polymorphic. While in many instances it has brought forth highly commendable performances of good will which, because of the very nature of the subject matter and problems involved, have been of short duration, there has been a broadening interest in long-time programs involving joint collaboration by a number of the other American republics and the United States over a considerable period of time. The worthiness of such long-time programs cannot be overestimated. Initiated by the government of the United States, their objective is to bring about and maintain the solidarity of the republics of the western hemisphere to the end that there may be complete harmony between them in all spheres of activity. This cannot be accomplished in a year nor in a decade, however. Antiquated buildings can be torn down and modern structures erected within a few months to change the entire outward aspect of a community, but, with relatively few exceptions, human lives change more slowly and generations may be required to bring about desired changes in feeling, attitude, and outlook. Thus, long-time programs provide not only mutual aid at the moment and in the immediate future but are also the means of creating an enduring, welding faith in the honesty of purpose and integrity of action on the part of the government of the United States and the governments of the other American republics.

The importance of such long-time programs in relation to future affairs of the United States is quite apparent. Indirectly, their continued success or their failure may influence the life of every American in future generations. Moreover, with a large portion of the world looking towards the United States for leadership in postwar developments, other nations, especially those in this hemisphere, will follow their development closely. Consequently, these programs require the finest in administration and organization. Also, quite apart from these aspects, upon the conclusion of the present war, the United States will be faced with a national debt almost beyond prewar comprehension. Unquestionably, efforts will be directed towards cur-

tailoring certain government activities in order to assist in reducing that debt. With good administration, a government-sponsored program of technical cooperation with the other American republics can be carried on with an infinitesimally small fraction of our prewar annual tax bill.

The foregoing remarks show something of the need for exceptionally fine administration in this undertaking. The question might be asked: What form or type of long-range, technical program is being carried on to further the Good Neighbor policy and to contribute to the mutual economic security of the American republics? Before answering that question, it might be well to consider for a moment something of the over-all needs of those countries. There is probably no other field of activity in which there is more common interest than in agriculture. Tremendous improvement can be made in agricultural production methods and techniques in most of the other republics in the western hemisphere but for many reasons, including the lack of scientists and technical guidance, this has not been effected. Thus, there is the need upon the part of the other American nations to improve their agricultural industry. At the same time, the United States needs tropical agricultural products which those nations can produce. Hence this situation constitutes a sphere of common interest which lends itself to joint action and collaboration under the Good Neighbor concept and also forms the basis for a long-time, cooperative program by the United States and a number of the other American republics that will lead to greater economic stability within the hemisphere.

United States participation in this scientific agricultural program is carried out primarily under two lines of authority. One is under Public Law 63, passed by the 1st session of the 76th Congress and approved on May 3, 1939. Commonly referred to as "Public 63," it provides for the detail of United States employees having special scientific or other technical qualifications to any of the American republics requesting such services. The second authority stems from an interdepartmental committee for cooperation between the American republics. Under this latter authority, our agricultural aid to the other American nations has largely taken place in the form of cooperative agricultural experiment stations which are being established in the tropical regions of a number of Central and South American countries. In general, the United States government furnishes scientists trained in fields of research most urgently needed by each country, as well as direction of the stations. The participating country

also supplies national scientists to work with and be trained further by the personnel from the United States. The physical plant including buildings, land, and much of the equipment, is furnished by the co-operating country. The problem of administration and organization of these stations is somewhat unique in American government administration and requires more than superficial consideration because of the factors involved.

Several of the experiment stations are of necessity in remote, comparatively isolated portions of a country, temporarily largely without modern conveniences, so that the problem of isolation, particularly with reference to personnel, is extremely important. In some respects, it is almost as if the station were located on an isolated, pin-point island. This condition introduces personnel problems which usually are of minor consideration in agricultural experiment stations in the United States. Many items generally not considered especially important in temperate zones, such as in the United States, are of considerable importance in these somewhat isolated, tropical research centers. For example, the spacing of living-quarters or houses one from the other may mean the difference between symphony and cacophony. In the tropics, houses are open and voices and sounds carry. Families living too close together may soon "get on one another's nerves" but if homes are separated, this situation is less likely to occur. Minor differences in modes of living between staff members and their families and differences of opinion regarding scientific research sometimes assume seemingly tremendous proportions under such tropical conditions.

For purposes of illustration, this problem may be expressed by the algebraic expression: $(a) \times (b) = (c)$, in which (a) represents a sphere of contention comprised of all the differences of opinion, personal irritations due to lack of modern living conditions, any number of seemingly small items in our daily existence which do not satisfy or are not in complete harmony with our thinking and feeling, minor "bones of contention," and similar items of discontent. (b) represents the sum total of all the factors and elements of an individual's life that tend to permit dissipation of the non-harmonious feelings represented by (a) which have accumulated during a unit period of work, such as a day or a week. It is in effect an expenditure sphere. For example, in the United States, at the end of the day or over a week end, a man and his family may go to a movie, visit friends not directly associated with his daily work, play golf, swim, fish, or participate in sports,

develop hobbies, listen to music, dance, read, or they may take part in any number of activities which in reality act as vents for a gradual expenditure of any non-harmonious feelings that may have developed during the course of his work or that may have been experienced by his family at home. The product of (a) and (b) is a constant, (c).

In an everyday, harmonious, peaceful course of events, the expenditure sphere (b) is greater than the contention sphere (a), or at least (b) is equal to (a), and under such conditions the situation may almost escape detection as a problem at all. Substituting, this harmonious condition may be represented by the arithmetic expression:

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{rclcl} 4 & \times & 4 & = & 16 \\ (a) & \times & (b) & = & (c) \end{array}$$

However, if the expenditure sphere (b) is reduced, by reducing the land area, as when people are confined to a small island, or by reducing their non-business or non-professional activities, then the seeming importance of the minor differences of opinion, lack of conveniences, minor irritations, etc., rise in order to maintain the constant, (c). Thus, this latter situation can be shown by:

$$(2) \quad \begin{array}{rclcl} 8 & \times & 2 & = & 16 \\ (a) & \times & (b) & = & (c) \end{array}$$

In this case, the various items in the contention sphere (a) have assumed twice the magnitude and importance as compared with situation (1). Strains and stresses develop between personnel due to inequalities between the contention and the expenditure spheres. People become dissatisfied and upset upon the slightest provocation. Small items of daily conduct that probably pass almost unnoticed under a "4 x 4" relationship, loom large and assume a grotesque importance if an "8 x 2" situation exists. A still more extreme condition can be represented by:

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{rclcl} 16 & \times & 1 & = & 16 \\ (a) & \times & (b) & = & (c) \end{array}$$

This may be considered a very extreme, breaking-point situation in which the discrepancy between the contention sphere (a) and the expenditure sphere (b) in an individual's life is so great and unstable that the situation cannot be endured and some change must be made. Naturally, the good administrator strives to create a condition in which (b) is much greater than (a), or at the very least, in which they are equal.

However, in this foreign, technical program in order to achieve and maintain this desired condition, more diligence and thought are required than in the case of the administration of a technical action program in the United States.

Extremists of all types, except those who emulate good administration, are to be avoided in selecting administrative personnel for either domestic or foreign technical agriculture experiment stations. In our agricultural colleges, students are taught to judge livestock by a score card on which the animal is judged or rated point by point. In selecting scientific personnel for administrative positions, all of the factors entering into the fitness of the individual for the position need to be considered and rated carefully. For purposes of illustration, two types of extremists ill-suited for positions carrying administrative responsibility and administrative authority in a foreign, technical agricultural program will be discussed briefly.

The first example has been termed the "wheel-spinner." The guiding administrative principle of this type is the creation and maintenance of activity. This is brought about by an almost never-ending flow of talk, memoranda, letters, and conferences without due regard for their relative value, direction, or continuity. Individuals of this type have been likened to a swimmer who simply treads water or to a self-styled athlete who confines his prowess to stationary running, or running-in-place. A great deal of effort and energy are expended and considerable activity is displayed but no advancement or progress is made, hence, the term "wheel-spinning."

The second example stems from the very nature of technical research work itself. Scientists, especially in the physical sciences, frequently are highly individualistic. They sometimes guard their professional ideas jealously and often are by no means cooperative in their endeavors. Bitter, long-lasting, personal feuds not infrequently develop, resulting in the formation of schisms and cliques. This is the result partly of research itself and partly of the system of administration in our own universities and agricultural experiment stations. Recognition to research workers usually takes the form of advances in salary and professorial rank and is based on the quantity and quality of individual research performed rather than on the accomplishments of a group as a whole. Such conditions are not conducive to cooperative effort but, unfortunately, many problems in biological research are so complex that the greatest hope for their solution lies in

open, frank, cooperative research by a group of scientists rather than by isolated individuals. In many instances, these individualists make outstanding names for themselves professionally but many are revealed as ordinary creatures when one thought removed from their particular, narrow, professional line of research. Students sometimes refer to them as "prima donnas." Because of successful research, they advance in rank and some finally reach high positions with respect to faculty status. Very often such positions also carry administrative authority as well. All too frequently, there has been a failure to recognize that there is no effective correlation between a man's ability as a scientist and his ability as an administrator. Men frequently are selected for administrative posts in our domestic agricultural experiment stations and research institutions largely for their achievements and reputation as research scientists rather than for administrative qualifications.

The situation may also be described from a somewhat different approach. In the United States, upon completion of his formal university education, a man trained for research in plant or animal science usually begins his research career by becoming connected with an agricultural experiment station or with a university wherein he may devote his efforts to solving definite technical problems. His activities are narrowed down not only to one field of endeavor but usually are even polarized to one aspect of a larger problem. Thus, his attention is focused upon a narrow line of activity and by following such a line with diligence and success over a period of years, he comes to be recognized as an authority in that particular field. His advancement on the faculty usually is based upon his research ability in a very limited sphere of activity. Yet, as he advances, the higher salaried and higher ranking positions involve more and more administrative problems with a corresponding decrease in time and thought for research. There is an increasingly greater demand for decisions which pertain to administrative matters and, as a result, there is less attention to personal research. When a scientist advances high enough in rank, in many cases almost his entire time must be devoted to administration rather than to research. Thus there is a complete reversal of responsibility from research to administration and yet as a rule the basis upon which these individuals are selected initially is research alone. If a man is an outstanding success as a research scientist, it does not follow *per se* that he will be a good administrator.

As mentioned previously, the cooperative agricultural experiment stations which are being established in some of the other American republics as part of our Good Neighbor policy, are operated jointly by the United States government and by the government of the country in which the station is located. This joint action calls for a high degree of cooperation between the members of the staff from the United States and the local members appointed by the cooperating government. The director, in particular, has a dual responsibility to both governments and must possess the faculty of maintaining harmonious relations between the two sets of staff members as well as with the people of the country in which the station is located.³ This requires an understanding of peoples and a tolerance for the opinions, customs, and habits of others far beyond that required of personnel in experiment stations in the United States, and such understanding is an extremely important item in the administration of this technical program in the other American republics. To insure continued progress and success requires the leadership of men who, above all, are excellent administrators. The ideal is found in a man who is both an excellent administrator and an outstandingly successful research scientist.

Participation by the United States government in this cooperative technical program is guided and administered by a comparatively small staff in Washington. Each experiment station is concerned not only with problems of particular interest to the country in which it is located but also with problems that concern the western hemisphere as a whole. The Washington staff formulates over-all programs and approves the specific phases of these programs carried out by each station. Efficient and successful

administration of this type of activity requires a high degree of coordination between members of the field and Washington staffs. Due to many factors, it would be a relatively easy matter for a member of one of the stations to lose sight of his part in the entire program, with a consequent decrease in morale. However, by formulating long-time line projects which show the position of every station and every man in the entire program, each scientist ascertains the part he contributes. Under this system, definite objectives can be kept in mind easily by each individual and he is able to visualize how his work contributes to the attainment of those objectives. This calls for an uninterrupted flow of action and thoughts through the administrative channels in Washington to the field staff and vice versa. It requires leadership that has the vision to see the entire forest but at the same time does not lose sight of the fact that a forest is made up of individual trees.

Due to the kaleidoscopic complexity of the program brought about by the large number of heterogeneous factors which must be considered, its successful, harmonious administration calls upon multitudinous aptitudes and faculties. The situation brings to mind the words ascribed to the French philosopher, René Descartes:

If, therefore, anyone wishes to search out the truth of things in serious earnest, he ought not to select one special science; for all the sciences are conjoined with each other and interdependent.

With qualified administrative leaders and scientists, this foreign, technical program is destined to bring lasting benefits to all people of the western hemisphere.

³. For additional reference to the human relationship aspect of this program, see "Extension Work at Tingo Maria," by Charles P. Loomis, *Agriculture in the Americas*, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 23-26, 36, Feb. 1944.